

Curriculum and Didactics: a matter of power. The case of the University of Madeira

Sousa, Jesus Maria
University of Madeira
Email: angi@uma.pt

Abstract

From the niche of curriculum studies (declaring from the beginning, the assumption of my involvement and commitment in one of the parts), this paper aims at discussing the not always peaceful relationship existing between the Curriculum, on the one hand, and the Didactics, on the other, in the context of Education.

Retaking a discussion already started, from the revisiting of some authors who have been reflecting on convergences and divergences in this relationship, this paper is an attempt to define and delimit these two fields in their historical and epistemological routes, since their appearance as areas of knowledge, not necessarily scientific ones, their cultural traditions, overlaps and gaps, in order to concentrate later on the matter of power, in which educational institutions in Portugal are involved.

The description of the case of the University of Madeira intends to illustrate the issues listed and discussed at the theoretical level.

Keywords: Curriculum and Didactics; historical and epistemological routes; power.

Introduction

It is important to start the debate locating the exact time of the birth of each one of these fields of knowledge, questioning about who appeared first: Didactics or Curriculum? Curriculum or Didactics¹?

The word Didactics originates from the Greek *didaskhein*, which meant “to be a teacher, to educate”. And to be a teacher meant that he (there was no “she”) should be a knower, who mastered a certain field of knowledge: the contents, the subject-matters, the disciplines, to be transmitted to the students in order to be reproduced by them.

According to Gundem (1998), some derivatives are as follows:

Didaktikos: apt at teaching

Didaskaleion: school, classroom, class

Didaskalia: information, advice, correction

Didaskalikos: belonging to teaching

Didaskalion: knowledge, science, school fees

Didaskalos: teacher

Didasko: to be a teacher, teach, be instructed and taught, learn by oneself, acquire, give somebody a lesson, let somebody be educated.

Contrasting to *Mathetics*, for which the focus was the learner and the process of learning, as attested by the Socratic method of eliciting knowledge from the mind of a person through interrogation and logical reasoning

(*Maieutics*), the Didactics was born related to the ability to teach something to somebody, to instruct, to inform about a content that should be learnt.

1. Historical and epistemological routes: convergences and divergences

In fact, the word *Didache* with the meaning of “teaching” was the title of an early Christian treatise, dated second part of first century: “The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles”, the Greek manuscript of which was rediscovered in 1873 and the Latin version only in 1900. The treaty started with the “Teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles (or Nations) by the Twelve Apostles”, being the oldest surviving written catechism. Probably this influenced the definition of the adjective didactic with the meaning of “teaching or intending to teach a moral lesson” (Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 1994).

As far as Curriculum is concerned, we can say this word is Latin and means race, the place where one is supposed to run (racecourse), and what is done during the race as well. So etymologically it is obvious that the root of Didactics appeared first, due to its Greek origin.

But many centuries have passed until both terms arrived almost simultaneously at the educational world taking in consideration what Hamilton (2003) writes:

“Between about 1450 and 1650, a cluster of words, including syllabus, class, curriculum, and subject didactics, entered the European educational lexicon - and thence to the Americas, south and north.” (Hamilton, 2003: 02)

And contrarily to Gudem (1998) who considered that the word curriculum was first used by Daniel Georgius Morhof (1639-1691), professor in Rostock from 1660, Doll (2002) anticipates its use to almost a century before, saying that

“It was in one of Ramus’s works, a taxonomy of knowledge, the “*Professio Regia*” (1576), published four years after his death, that the word curriculum first appears referring to a sequential course of study” (Doll, 2002, p. 31).

Nevertheless these two authors are unanimous considering that curriculum appeared as a reaction against the medieval Scholastics which aimed at the validation of Christian dogmas by means of the Platonic and Aristotelian logic, in a context of solitary deep study in the attempt to reconcile faith and reason. The students were let alone unraveling among complex and confused information. Even when referring to the seven liberal arts, which supposed a certain organization, Hamilton says that “they were fluid rather than fixed bodies of knowledge and, as a result, their form as communication media was equally imprecise. They were more texts than textbooks” (Hamilton, 2003, p. 08).

So Curriculum aimed at the simplification of knowledge making it accessible to the students with a purpose of “teaching and not thinking”, focusing on Didactics rather than on Dialectics. The taxonomy of knowledge, or syllabus sequentially arranged in an “unbroken linear progression” is by Doll (2002) called a “logical map of knowledge”. There is therefore a close

relationship between “the mapping of knowledge” and “the accomplishment of instruction”. That is to say: to make knowledge clear and understandable it should be simplified as Hamilton says: “Starting with a map of knowledge, Ramus reduced such knowledge into a tree of knowledge, using repeated binary division” (Id. *ibid*).

And without using the terms Didactics or Curriculum, we cannot fail to mention the *Ratio Studiorum* published in 1599, under the Jesuitical Generalship of Claudio Aquaviva, after a preparation for over 40 years. In addition to presenting a set of operating rules for the Colleges of the Society of Jesus, it also contemplated a set of rules about how and what to teach, to be applied in the twelve provinces that constituted the Jesuits world then (Castile, Aragon, Andalusia, France, Italy, High and Lower Germany, Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Japan and last but not the least, Portugal) for the intellectual and pedagogical preparation of the teacher, after the phase of the spiritual exercises. We may reflect on the combination of “what” and “how” to teach, if we read the following rules, as examples:

“The lecture should just explain the ancient authors, and never the modern ones. It is preferable that the teacher talks within a certain order and preparation and exposes what he wrote at home, reading the entire book or the speech he has in his hands” (Rule 27, common to the teachers of Lower Studies).

“Even in harmless questions to faith and piety, no one should dare to introduce new subjects that are not secured by a capable author without consulting superiors” (Rule 6, common to the teachers of Higher Studies).

The minimal detail of order and organization of a classroom is visible here:

“In order to prevent precipitation or running at the end of the classes, those by the door go out firstly, while the teacher observes them; or everybody may leave silently” (Rule 44, common to the teachers of Lower Studies).

“Pay particular attention to guarantee that all observe silence and modesty; that anyone roams from one place to another, or changes the place, delivers presents or messages to one another, or leaves the room, especially in groups of two or more, at the same time” (Rule 43, of the teacher of Rhetorics).

Finally in 1638, Jan Amos Komensky, better known as Comenius, gave greater visibility to his *Didactica Magna*, a Latin translation of *Česká didaktika* (Czech Didactics), already published in 1627, generating a debate about whether the teaching would be an art or a science, with the focus on a particular method of teaching that appealed to logical thinking, originated from simple and concrete concepts rather than memorization generally in use at that time. So the word Didactics (*Didactica*) appeared for the first time related to a method of teaching.

Born in the former Bohemia (now a Czech Republic region) and with an extremely rich life experience, with long stays in Germany, Poland, Sweden, Transylvania, England, Holland, Hungary, etc., Comenius was a defender of universal education through a generalized access to school, regardless of each one’s economic status, gender, or disability. Hired by Sweden in order to launch an educational reform, he made literacy become mandatory to all residents of this kingdom, from 1687, making this country the first one, at the beginning of 19th century, with no illiteracy rate.

Having closely lived with Descartes who was also in Sweden under the protection of Queen Christina, the Didactics of Comenius advocated the teaching of everything to everyone (*omnis omnia docere*). Focused on the method, the sequencing of the steps was thoroughly assured: starting from sensorial experiences with objects, or daily experiences, the teacher was supposed to develop an understanding of concepts through reason. The practice was the basis of his method, which was to be fast, economical and not so tiring.

This way he began introducing texts in the vernacular languages, instead of Latin, strictly observing certain steps. These are the ones I consider more significant to our aim, extracted from a set presented by Libâneo (2002):

“[...] We should always start from the causes whenever we intend to teach the nature of things. [...]”

“[...] What is taught should be followed by evidences of practical application with demonstration of its usefulness. [...]”

“[...] There should be an order in the presentation of things (each one in due course). [...]”

Not so successful as Comenius, Wolfgang Ratke, also known as Wolfgangus Raticius (1571-1635), devised a new method for teaching languages quickly (despite the fact of being Comenius who published the *Novissima Linguarum Methodus* in 1648), based on Bacon's inductive philosophy advocating a natural sequence for the acquisition of knowledge: from the particular to the general, from the mother tongue to foreign languages.

Under the influence of Bacon's Aphorisms, Raticius wrote his own didactic aphorisms, mentioned by Hoff (2008):

“Go from the known to the unknown. (...)”

The general must precede the particular.

The confused knowledge must precede the distinct knowledge.

The easiest and most necessary exercise should precede the more difficult and less necessary exercise.

Everything should be taught in accordance with the order or with the course of the nature.

No more than one thing at a time.

Everything in one's mother tongue firstly.

From the mother tongue to another language.

All without embarrassment.

Nothing should be learned by heart. The reason: It is against nature.

Uniformity in all things.

First, the thing in itself; then the mode of it.

Everything through experience and research of the details”

As we can see, order, simplicity and organization, akin to what happen in natural life, were the priority axes of both Curriculum and Didactics in line with the spirit of the Renaissance and Enlightenment which gave primacy to reason: Curriculum giving more emphasis to the organization of the contents (the methodization of knowledge) while the Didactics was turned to the organization of the ways how to transfer that knowledge.

From then on, Curriculum and Didactics received great influence from the emergent psychology which, at its first steps as a science brought a fresh look at the child. But instead of saying that “Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Herbart, though with different marks, are included in the psychological didactic phase” (Libâneo, 2002), I would rather say that they contributed for a pedagogical shift in the area of Curriculum: from the one-dimensional curricular model centered on the contents to another one-dimensional curricular model focused on the methods, as a psychologized Curriculum.

In fact, Libâneo declared right at the beginning of his text, that “this is obviously a look from the didactics, but a didactics which explicitly recognizes the importance of the purposes and contents of teaching in its socio-cultural and institutional frameworks, that is to say, the curriculum.” According to my interpretation, from an interested and implied Curriculum point of view, as I equally assumed in the beginning of this text, we can draw the conclusion that we are talking about the same ideas, only using different labels. Because there is no doubt that, in opposition to the theory of the homunculus, Rousseau (1712-1778), Pestalozzi (1746-1827), Herbart (1776-1841) and Froebel (1778-1852) were absolutely crucial at the stage of the psychologization of the teaching methods: Rousseau with his theory of natural goodness of man, Pestalozzi with his pedagogy of love, Herbart as the father of scientific pedagogy with his “*Formalstufen*”, and Froebel with his kindergartens and the metaphor of the child as a plant. The pedagogy shows the purposes of education while the psychology, the way, the means and obstacles, according to Herbart (1806) in his *General Pedagogy*, demonstrating the importance of psychology in the theory of education.

They are, in fact, the announcers of the New School movement formally established through the foundation of the *Bureau International des Écoles Nouvelles*, by Adolphe Ferrière, in Geneve in 1899, acknowledging or giving rise to new educational experiences focused on active teaching methods such as the one centered on the biosocial needs of the child advocated by the Belgian Jean-Ovide Decroly (1871-1932) at his *École de l'Ermitage*; the learning by doing's method of the North-American John Dewey (1859-1952) practiced at the Laboratory Schools of the University of Chicago, presented in a book significantly entitled *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902); the atmosphere of freedom (not license) and self-governance provided by the Scottish Alexander Neill (1883-1973) at his *Summerhill School*; and the early childhood education method of the Italian Maria Montessori (1870-1952) making use of developmentally appropriate sensorial materials, at her *Casa dei Bambini*. These are well-known examples of methods influenced by the emergent human and natural sciences (biology, neurology, psychology) strictly linked to the names of those pedagogues.

However it is important to underline that a radical psychologization of a teaching method, by influence of Freud and Lacan, for example, could dilapidate the original idea of organization advocated by both Curriculum and Didactics, as it was the case of the libertarian pedagogical trends of the first decades of 20th century.

It is however in the context of the space race led by the two blocks, emerging from the end of World War II that Curriculum and Didactics just

overlapped, in my opinion, becoming closer than ever to each other. The launch of Sputnik by the Russians in 1957 succeeded in alerting the Western world to an essential element missing in any planning: the objectives, to know exactly what to reach. Contents and methods seemed to be only means to reach the goals after all. That is the reason why teachers should be trained in Didactics, to become good technicians (good planners, performers and evaluators), making the most of their time. From this perspective, “it is further worth noting that didactics subsumes ‘curriculum’ as one issue besides or interwoven with other issues like teaching and learning, schooling, school administration, etc.” (Hopman and Riquarts, 1995, as referred in Gundem and Hopman, 1998).

Of course Taylor’s Scientific Management did contribute to invade education with ideas of efficiency, productivity, rationality, elimination of waste, standardization of best practices, competitiveness, mechanization and automation, underlining the principles of organization already enunciated before.

From my point of view (of Curriculum), the phase of the technological curricular model triggered by Bobbitt (1918; 1924) and consolidated by Tyler (1949) and the Rationale Tyler in the following two or three decades was the most acute phase of the didactization of Curriculum focused on the curriculum development, addressed to teacher education in agreement with modern times. At this time, Curriculum was Didactics as Didactics was Curriculum.

As we can see, being close in their origins, and having become even more close to each other in this particular post-war period, with their obsession for the taxonomies of objectives, these two fields paradoxically raised a gap between them precisely at this time: having nothing to distinguish them, the expression Didactics became prevalent on the European Continent - in German speaking countries (*Didaktik*), in Scandinavia (*didaktik*), in France (*didactique*) and in the Iberian world (*didáctica*), while the word Curriculum was adopted in the English-speaking Western world.

And sometimes words are responsible for creating an identity. According to Silva (1997): “I am what the other is not; I am not what the other is”. And difference

“is not established in isolation and independently. It depends upon processes of exclusion, guard borders, division strategies. The difference is never just and purely difference, but also and fundamentally hierarchy, valuation and categorization” (T. T. da Silva, 1997, p. 25).

I dare to say that a mere question of linguistics provided conditions to think differently. A new identity as far as Curriculum was concerned was forged from the I Conference held in the University of Rochester in 1973, later influencing Portuguese scholars too, as I am going to evidence in the following point. Unexpectedly, according to Pinar (2010), this Conference inaugurated a new phase in Curriculum. He affirms:

“My PhD mentor, Paul R. Klohr, and I had planned the 1973 Rochester Conference as a “state-of-the field” meeting; we did not foresee that it would

initiate a decade of dispute that would result in the field mapped in *Understanding Curriculum*" (Pinar et al., 1995) (Pinar, 2010, p. 528).

The paradigm shift from a strongly didactized "curriculum development" to "understanding curriculum" opened the field for an in-depth reading of the social reality at schools, with a special emphasis on the "hidden curriculum" previously reflected and studied by educational philosophers and sociologists like Althusser, Bourdieu and Passeron, Baudelot and Establet, Bowles and Gintis and others. But this time the reflection was made by the curriculumists themselves.

As a matter of fact a new identity of Curriculum presupposed to be different from Didactics and this raised a problem of power in the field of educational knowledge. The establishment of borders was therefore necessary.

In short I can say that the reconceptualization of curriculum studies claimed to be a specific area of scientific research in descriptive and analytical terms rather than for normative purposes, thus keeping itself away from a set of pedagogical rules, a recipe to be executed by teachers unaware of a macro context under different sorts of social pressures (political, economic, ideological, and so on). From this perspective, the Didactics is not an equivalent of Curriculum. Though an extremely important area in teacher education focused on specific disciplines (how to teach Maths is different from how to teach a Foreign Language or teach Natural Sciences) it is not its responsibility to make teachers or future teachers reflect on and be aware of outside forces that frame the school.

That is the reason why Curriculum may constitute a real menace to the stability of the pre-established (status quo) aimed at by the politicians and for that reason it may be at risk nowadays.

2. The case of the University of Madeira

The second part of this paper will focus on a specific reality, to better understand at a concrete level the tension existing between Didactics and Curriculum, as already explained theoretically, in an attempt to clarify (without a purpose of generalization) the evolution of these two areas. As an insider, who has lived the process of the creation of the University of Madeira, with previous backgrounds related to initial teacher education at *Escola do Magistério Primário do Funchal*, *Escola Superior de Educação da Madeira*, and in-service professionalization of teachers of 2nd and 3rd cycle of basic education and of secondary education, I would not say that the description I am going to proceed is the result of a case study, with all the known characteristics of a research methodology, as Yin (1993; 2005) or Stake (1995) define it. According to Yin (1993), descriptive case studies (one of the types of case studies he stated – exploratory, explanatory and descriptive) require a descriptive theory to be developed before starting the research project. But in fact my study object was not defined previously to my immersion in the field in a way that observation and note taking occurred in a systematic way.

What I intend to do now is rather a description and interpretation of a phenomenon of my interest, looking backwards, by reconstruction of a story, from my viewpoint as a participant in my natural environment, making use of multiple sources of data, that might eventually illustrate the theoretical discussion above.

Once clarified that this is not a pure research case study, it may nevertheless contain some typical elements of an intrinsic (Stake, 1995) and descriptive single case study (Yin, 1993), with historical features (André, 2005) related to Didactics and Curriculum in teacher education in Madeira, since the foundation of *Escola do Magistério Primário do Funchal*, in 1943, as the remotest antecessor of the University of Madeira for this issue.

In order to better frame teacher education in Madeira, it is necessary to recall that in 1942 the schools of Lisbon, Oporto, Coimbra and Braga were reopened after a closure for more than five years of all schools addressed to primary teachers' education, with a study programme published by the Decree-law n. 32242, of 5th September, to be applied everywhere in Portugal.

Going back to this study programme (see Table 1), organised in four semesters, there was no mention to Curriculum (theory or development).

Disciplines	1 st sem.	2 nd sem.	3 rd sem.	4 th sem.
Pedagogy and General Didactics	5	-	-	I
Applied Psychology to Education	3	6	-	N
Special Didactics	-	6	6	T
School Hygiene	3	-	-	E
Drawing and Educational Manual Works	2	3	2	R
Woman's Education	2	2	2	N
Music and Choir Singing	2	2	2	S
Legislation and School Administration	-	-	3	H
Nation's Political and Administrative Organization	2	-	-	I
Moral and Civic Education	2	-	-	P
Teaching Practice	5	8	8	

Table 1 - 1942 study programme

As we see Pedagogy and General Didactics in the 1st semester was a more theoretical subject-matter supposing that Special Didactics would deal with more practical problems appearing in the internship.

Almost twenty years later, a new study programme (see Table 2), published by the Decree-law n^o 43369, of 2nd December, deliberated to broaden the scope of Pedagogy and General Didactics with History of Education. With the same duration, this new programme maintained most of the subjects, complemented with Physical Education. But the previous Special Didactics was unfolded in Special Didactics of A group, including the Didactics of Portuguese Language, History and Drawing, and in Special Didactics of B group, including the Didactics of Arithmetic and Geometry, Natural and Geographical Sciences and Manual Works.

Disciplines	1 st sem.	2 nd sem.	3 rd sem.	4 th sem.
Pedagogy, General Didactics and History of Education	4	4	1	1
Applied Psychology to Education	4	3	3	2
Special Didactics of A group	3	2	2	2
Special Didactics of B group	3	2	2	2

Drawing and Educational Manual Works	2	2	2	1
Woman's Education	2	2	2	-
Legislation and School Administration	-	2	2	2
Nation's Political and Administrative Organization	-	2	1	-
Moral Education	2	1	1	-
School Hygiene	2	2	-	-
Musical Education	2	2	2	-
Physical Education	2	2	2	-
Teaching Practice	2	4	8	-
Internship	-	-	-	12

Table 2 - 1960 study programme

In 1978, a new study programme (see Table 3) was published by the Order N°157/78, of 30th June, demanding 3 years of education distributed among four areas: Sciences of Education (for the first time with this designation), Expression and Communication, Experience and Teaching Practice, beyond Technical Activities and Moral as an elective. As we can see, again no subject within Curriculum field in the educational area appeared despite some rudiments could eventually be addressed in Methodology and Pedagogical Techniques or in School Organization.

Area	Disciplines	1 st year	2 nd year	3 rd year
Sciences of Education	Pedagogy	3	3	2
	Developmental Psychology	4	2	1
	Methodology and Pedagogical Techniques	-	2	1
	Health	-	2	-
	Deontology, School Administration and Legislation, Organization,	-	-	1
Expression and Communication	Portuguese	4	2	1
	Children's Literature	-	2	-
	Visual Communication and Expression	3	2	-
	Musical Expression	2	2	-
	Movement and Drama	2	1	-
Experience	Physical Education and Sports	3	2	-
	Mathematics	2	2	-
	Natural Sciences	3	2	-
	Cultural Anthropology	2	-	-
	Modern and Contemporaneous History of Portuguese Society	-	2	-
Teaching Practice	Level 1	4	-	-
	Level 2	-	6	16+6
Activities	Technical Activities	-	-	2
	Moral (elective)	(1)	-	-
		32	32	30

Table 3 - 1978 study programme

So I can say that the area of Didactics (General and Special Didactics) in teacher education in Madeira followed the trend blowing all over Continental Europe, evidencing a great concern with teaching methodologies and techniques. Aiming at the same organizational objective, in 1975 the expression "curriculum development" started appearing in educational discourse and in study programmes for teacher education of the so-called "new" universities in Portugal: Universities of Minho and Aveiro.

In order to prepare the teaching staff for the future University of Madeira, through an institutional agreement established between the Regional Government of Madeira and the University of Minho, I myself together with some other colleagues attended an extension of Minho's Master

programme in Education, significantly entitled “Teaching Analysis and Organization”, during the school years of 1984-1986.

After the extinction of *Escola do Magistério Primário do Funchal*, and going on working at *Escola Superior de Educação da Madeira*, a new study programme (see Table 4) was published by the Ordinance nº 325/87, of 21st April. As we can see, neither Didactics nor Methodologies explicitly appeared then. With a teaching staff of the area of education holding that particular Minho’s Master, there was instead one course of Sciences of Education unfolded in three parts (I, II and III), disguising the paradigmatic shift that was already occurring in our minds. And concerning the specificity of Portuguese and Mathematics, the study plan created two new disciplines: Portuguese Teaching-Learning and Mathematics Teaching Learning, precisely to affirm a new philosophy different from Didactics of Portuguese and Didactics of Mathematics, that over weighted teaching rather than learning.

Year	Disciplines	A/S1/S2	A/S1/S2
1	Introduction to Linguistics and Literature	A	4
	Theory of Numbers and Complements of Logics	A	3
	Sciences of Physical and Social Environment I	A	6
	Sciences of Education I	A	5
	Non-Verbal Communication and Expression I	A	6
	Techniques of Portuguese Expression	S1	3
	Elective	S2	3
2	Portuguese	A	3
	Mathematics	A	3
	Sciences of Physical and Social Environment II	A	4
	Non-Verbal Communication and Expression II	A	6
	Sciences of Education II	A	4
	Elective	A	3
	Children’s Literature	S1	4
3	Teaching Practice I	S2	4
	Elective	A	3
	Sciences of Education III	A	4
	Portuguese Teaching-Learning	S1	3
	Mathematics Teaching-Learning	S1	3
	Teaching Practice II	S1	14
	Non-Verbal Communication and Expression III	S2	3
Teaching Practice III	S2	16	

Table 4 - 1987 ESEM’s study programme

In 1988, the University of Madeira was finally created by Decree-law nº 319-A/88, of 13th September, and a CIFOP (Integrated Centre for Teacher Education) was established similarly to what was happening in other universities, replacing the *Escola Superior de Educação*, normally linked to Polytechnic Higher Education. And a new study programme (see Table 5) was published by the Ordinance nº 1023/89, of 23rd November, to be applied to teacher education in Madeira, whilst that tendency in favour of Teaching-Learning was accentuated by spreading this concept to other areas: Non-Verbal Expression Teaching-Learning; Geography Teaching-Learning; Natural Sciences Teaching-Learning; History Teaching-Learning.

Year	Disciplines	A/S1/S2	Hours
1	Sciences of Education I	A	8
	Non-Verbal Communication and Expression	A	8
	Mathematics I	A	5
	Portuguese I	A	3

	Teaching Practice I	A	2
	Elective	A	2
	Sciences of Education II	A	4
	Natural Sciences	A	2
	Non-Verbal Expression Teaching-Learning I	A	4
2	Children's Literature	A	2
	Teaching Practice II	A	4
	History	S1	3
	Mathematics II	S1	4
	Portuguese II	S1	4
	Geography and Geography Teaching-Learning	S2	3
	Mathematics Teaching-Learning	S2	4
	Portuguese Teaching-Learning I	S2	4
	Sciences of Education III	A	2
	Natural Sciences and Natural Sciences Teaching-Learning	A	2
	Non-Verbal Expression Teaching-Learning II	A	4
3	History and History Teaching-Learning	A	2
	Teaching Practice III	A	12
	Learning Difficulties	S1	3
	Portuguese Teaching-Learning II	S1	2
	Elective	S2	3
	Seminar	S2	2

Table 5 - 1989 ESEM/CIFOP's study programme

The legal determination that all teachers independently of their level of education should hold a graduation of 4 years provided exceptional conditions for us to draw a study programme according to our educational beliefs, approved by a Resolution of the University Senate nº 70/98, published on 20th May 1998 (See Table 6). In the meantime the CIFOP was replaced by a Department of Education, as an organic unit of the University of Madeira, with the inherent scientific and pedagogical autonomy according to the legislation in force. The philosophy concerning teacher education is reflected in this particular study plan.

Year	Disciplines	S1/S2/ A	Hours	ECTS
	History and Philosophy of Education	S1	3	4
	Portuguese Teaching-Learning I	S1	5	7
	Mathematics Teaching-Learning I	S1	5	7
	Motor Physical Expres. Teaching-Learning I	S1	3	4,5
	Musical Expression Teaching-Learning I	S1	3	4,5
1	Health and First Aids	S1	3	3
	Developmental Psychology	S2	4	6
	Portuguese Teaching-Learning II	S2	6	7,5
	Mathematics Teaching-Learning II	S2	6	7,5
	Motor Physical Expres. Teaching-Learning II	S2	3	4,5
	Musical Expression Teaching-Learning II	S2	3	4,5
	Learning Psychology	S1	4	6
	Research in Education	S1	3	4
	Physical-Social Environm Teaching-Learning I	S1	4	5
	Plastic Expression Teaching-Learning I	S1	3	4,5
	Drama Teaching-Learning I	S1	3	4,5
2	Teaching Practice I	S1	4	6
	Curriculum Theory and Development	S2	4	5,5
	Educational Sociology	S2	3	4,5
	Physical-Social Environm Teaching-Learning II	S2	4	5
	Plastic Expression Teaching-Learning II	S2	3	4,5
	Drama Teaching-Learning II	S2	3	4,5
	Teaching Practice II	S2	4	6
	Teaching Models, Methods and Techniques	S1	3	4,5
	Personal Development	S1	3	4,5

	School Administration and Management	S1	3	4,5
	Foreign Language Teaching-Learning I	S1	3	4,5
	ICT in Education	S1	4	6
3	Teaching Practice III	S1	4	6
	Basic Education Methodology	S2	4	6
	Foreign Language Teaching-Learning II	S2	3	4,5
	Ethics and Professional Deontology	S2	3	4,5
	Educational Special Needs	S2	3	4,5
	Contemporaneous Cultural Themes	S2	3	4,5
	Teaching Practice IV	S2	4	6
	Multimedia Workshop	A	4	12
4	Seminar of Reflection on Teaching Practice	A	2	6
	Internship	A	14	42

Table 6 - 1998 UMa's study programme

There was already explicitly a subject named "Curriculum Theory and Development" and another on "Teaching Models, Methods and Techniques". And the Teaching-Learning term crossing all "scientific" disciplines was a trick to avoid the term Didactics, and aimed at a full integration of both theoretical-practical and scientific-pedagogical approaches. A struggle at the level of (scientific) power, reflected on the study plan, arose particularly in a small university fragmented into several Departments as it was the case of the University of Madeira (Fino & Sousa, 2003).

Later in this same year the INAFOP (National Institute for the Accreditation of Teacher Education) was created by the Decree-law nº 290/98, of 17th September, headed by Bártolo Paiva Campos, who launched the legal accreditation frame for study programmes of teacher education and the definition of the General and Specific profiles of professional performance of teachers of kindergarten and basic and secondary education. The articulation among the four components of education was recommended. This allowed us to create a component with the initials FADDE, meaning Education in the Area of Teaching and Specific Didactics (*Formação na Área da Docência e da Didática Específica*), congregating two components in one single subject.

When this study programme was submitted for review by the CAE (External Assessment Committee) in 2005 (the INAFOP was in the meantime extinguished in May 2002, under the XV Constitutional Government of Durão Barroso), it was the only one among seven programmes organized by universities to get the mention Excellent, in the field related to the "Study programme". Yet again a matter of power rose according to my interpretation. The Committee was led by João Formosinho and integrated Maria do Céu Roldão, Isabel Lopes da Silva and Vítor Trindade, substituting Miguel Zabalza, all experts known in the area of Curriculum Studies.

The first decade of 21st century was in fact the flowering stage for the area of Curriculum in the University of Madeira, sharing the idea of reconceptualization already burst and developed abroad. Grounded on an Aggregation on Curriculum defended before a jury integrated by the most representative researchers of this area, it was possible to create a FCT Research Centre in Education (CIE-UMa) in 2003, with a research line in Curriculum. A Doctoral programme in Education – Specialty of Curriculum was launched focusing on educational policy and critical and post-critical

curriculum theories. William Pinar himself integrated the so-called CEPAC (Permanent External Committee of Scientific Advice) of CIE-UMa.

However by imperatives of the Bologna process and the publication of the legal regime of professional qualification for teaching in preschool, primary and secondary education (Decree-law nº 43/2007, of 22nd February), which obliged the reorganization of teacher education in two cycles, new study programmes had to be submitted to a prior accreditation, and at that time... Well! It was not possible to integrate the components of teacher education as we did in the past. Portuguese was Portuguese and Didactics was Didactics, even if we claimed that specialists had considered this idea brilliant.

According to the legislation, the 2nd cycle study programme in Pre-school and Primary Education of the University of Madeira, with a total of 90 ECTS (3 semesters), had to be designed with a component of General Education having between 5-10 credits (in which Curriculum subjects were supposed to be), and a component of Specific Didactics having between 25-30 credits. It was in fact the announcement of a new phase in the process of tension between Didactics and Curriculum, allowing the emergence of (scientific) power obviously granted to Didactics, under the supervision of the A3ES (Agency for Evaluation and Accreditation of Higher Education). In addition, if this ratio was already meaningful in terms of unbalance, the publication of the Decree-law nº 79/2014, of 14th May, extending the duration of that Professionalizing Master to 2 years, corresponding to 120 ECTS, even more dangerously affected this ratio, reorganising the distribution of credits among the components of teacher education. Reducing General Education to a minimum of 6 credits, the balance of power hung clearly over Specific Didactics with a minimum of 36 credits.

To end the description, I can say that at the present moment teacher education in Portugal is becoming more and more didactized, being the A3ES the guardian of the area of Didactics, under the leadership of António Cachapuz, Expert in Didactics of Chemistry and Didactics of Sciences of the University of Aveiro. The team who visited the University of Madeira for the first evaluation of the cited programme was constituted of three members, two of them integrating the same research unit focused on Didactics: the CIDTFF of Aveiro, while the third one was Spanish. No one doubts that the great care with teaching methodologies manifested by the A3ES has made scientific departments of the University of Madeira look differently, with more respect, at these areas of knowledge. On the other hand however, and at the same time, the Agency has been withdrawing the reflexive, critical and political influence of Curriculum on teacher education.

As no longer Curriculum Development and much less General Didactics, Curriculum is a real menace to top-down directives (“teaching and not thinking”). Is Curriculum guilty or not guilty? Is it sentenced to death?

Notes

1. Curriculum and Didactics are written in capital letter along this text whenever they refer to the corresponding concepts.

References

- Althusser, L. (1985). *Aparelhos Ideológicos de Estado*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal Editora.
- André, Marli (2005). *Estudo de caso em pesquisa e avaliação educacional*. Brasília: Liber Livro Editora.
- Baudelot, Ch., & Establet, R. (1992). *Allez les filles!*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil.
- Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bobbitt, F. (1924). *How to make a curriculum*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-Cl. (1964). *Les Héritiers, les étudiants et la culture*. Paris: Éditions Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-Cl. (1970). *La reproduction. Éléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*. Paris: Éditions Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-Cl. (1979). *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Éditions Minuit.
- Boavida, J., & Amado, J. (2008). *Ciências da Educação: epistemologia, identidade e perspectivas*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1986). *Democracy and capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Doll Jr., W. (2002). Ghosts and the curriculum. In W. Doll Jr. and Noel Gough (Eds.). *Curriculum Visions* (pp. 23-70). New York: Peter Lang
- Fino, Carlos Nogueira & Sousa, Jesus Maria. (2003). Alterar o currículo: mudar a identidade. *Revista de Estudos Curriculares*, 1 (2), 233-250.
- Formosinho, J. et al (2005). *Relatório da Comissão de Avaliação Externa do curso de Licenciatura em Ensino Básico – 1º Ciclo*. Lisboa: CAE.
- Franca, L.S.J. (1952). *O método pedagógico dos Jesuítas*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Agir Editora.
- Gundem, B.B. (1998). Understanding European Didactics. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27 (1).
- Hamilton, D. (2003). *Instruction in the making: Peter Ramus and the beginnings of modern schooling*. American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 2003. Retrieved from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/152133.htm>
- Herbart, J.F. (1806, trad. Lorenzo Luzuriaga, 1914). *Pedagogía General derivada del fin de la educación*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Lectura.
- Hoff, S. (2008). A nova arte de ensinar: uma atividade de oficina. *Revista HISTEDBR On-line*, Campinas, 31 (67-82).
- Hopmann, S., & Riquarts, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Didaktik and/or Curriculum*. Kiel: Universität-Karl-Albrechts: IPN.
- Libâneo, J.C. (2002). Os campos contemporâneos da Didática e do Currículo: aproximações e diferenças. In M. R. Oliveira (Org.). *Confluências e divergências entre Didática e Currículo*. Campinas, SP: Papirus.
- Pinar, W. (2010). The next moment. In E. Malewski (Ed.). *Curriculum Studies Handbook. The next moment* (pp. 528-533). s.l.: Taylor & Francis.
- Ratio Atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Iesu*. (MDXCVIII). Neapoli: Typ. Tarquinii Longi.
- Silva, T.T. (1997). GT Currículo, 20ª Reunião Anul da ANPEd. Retrieved from <http://www.ufrgs.br/faced/gtcurric/tr978.html>
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research* (49-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, F. (1985. ed. orig. 1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. Easton: Hive.
- Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic Principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Webster (1998). *Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yin, R.K. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. London: Sage. 13
- Yin, R.K. (2005). *Estudo de caso: planejamento e métodos*. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Received: 01 September 2015

Accepted: 23 October 2015



European Association
of Curriculum
Studies



Portuguese Association
of Curriculum
Studies